REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are requested. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34, 36-40, 42-54, 56 and 57 are pending, claims 1, 16, 17, 19-23, 27, 28, 39, 43, 44, 46-50 and 54 having been amended, claim 55 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 56 and 57 having been newly added.

Specification

Applicants have amended the first paragraph of the application to re-insert a priority claim. Applicants wish to point out that the inserted priority claim now states that the present application is a continuation-in-part, rather than a continuation, of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/943,944, as stated in the originally-filed specification. Applicants are not claiming priority with respect to the non-verbal input and submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood how to process non-verbal input as of the filing date of this application, October 31, 2000. Therefore, Applicants submit that material with respect to processing non-verbal input is not essential material.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34, 36-40 and 42-54 Under 35 U.S.C. 112

On page 2 of the non-Final Office Action of February 10, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34, 36-40 and 42-54 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 1, 16, 17, 19-23, 27, 28, 39 and 43 were amended, however, Applicants submit that the amendments were made to more clearly recite the invention and were not necessary for overcoming the claim rejections.

The claims were amended to eliminate any reference to the generation of meaningful phrases, thereby broadening the claims. Further, Applicants are not claiming priority with

respect to non-verbal input and submit that, as of the filing date, October 31, 2000, one of

ordinary skill in the art would have known how to process non-verbal input. Therefore,

Applicants submit that the enablement requirement has been met and respectfully request that

the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34, 36-40 and 42-54 be withdrawn.

Double Patenting with Respect to Claim 55

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 55 on the grounds

of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claim

1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,675,707. Applicants submit that the cancellation of claim 55 renders

this rejection moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 55

be withdrawn.

102 Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34, 36-40 and 42-55

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34,

36-40 and 42-55 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

5,794,193 to Gorin. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 1, 16, 17, 19-23,

27, 28, 39 and 43 were amended, however, Applicants submit that the amendments were

made to more clearly recite the invention and were not necessary for overcoming the claim

rejections.

The present application is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,110, which

is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent No. 5,675,707, filed on September 15, 1995. Because

the grandparent application was filed on the same day as Gorin, Applicants submit that Gorin

is not prior art with respect to matter disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,675,707. Applicants

further submit that the subject matter of the claims, with the possible exception of the non-

verbal input, is clearly disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,675,707. For at least this reason,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34, 36-40 and

42-55 be withdrawn.

103 Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34, 36-40 and 42-55

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 15-30, 34,

36-40 and 42-55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

5,384,892 to Strong in view of "On automated language acquisition", J. Acoust. Soc. Am.,

June 1995 to Gorin ("Gorin paper"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended claim 1 is directed to an automated task classification system that operates

on a task objective of the user. The system includes, among other things, a recognizer that

spots at least one of a plurality of meaningful phrases in an input communication of the user

including verbal input and non-verbal input, wherein each of the plurality of meaningful

phrases has an association with at least one of a predetermined set of task objectives.

Strong, at col. 5, lines 10-40, discloses:

> The language model generator/interpreter 230 determines, based upon the
> current operating conditions of system 100, sequences of words which are
> expected to be received by recognizer 220 in order to limit the scope of the
> vocabulary search. In other words, language model generator/interpreter 230
> queries running application programs, such as 241,242, etc., in order to
> determine each of these application programs' current contexts. In addition,
> the current state of operating system 244, is also used to determine items
> which will be in the language model. In sum, depending on which application
> programs are running, and the current operating state of the operating system
> 244, the language model generator/interpreter 230 transmits different
> language models to recognizer 220. This is known as "dynamic" language
> model generation.
>
> Once language model generator 230 determines the current operating context,
> it computes the language model information 222 and transmits it as a
> sequence of signals to recognizer 220. Then, based on this language model
> information, recognizer 220 will determine what words may have been spoken
> as determined from the features 211 received from speech feature extractor
> 210. Features are combined in a variety of ways by recognizer 220 until
> complete words are determined from the features based on expected words as
> defined by language model 222. Then, recognizer 220 transmits recognized
> words 221 to the language model generator/interpreter process 230 for

interpretation and performance of actions according to the interpretation of the transmitted words 221 by 230.

Thus, <u>Strong</u> discloses transmitting different language models to recognizer 220, based on current operating conditions of the system. Recognizer 220 may then determine what words were spoken based on the language models.

Applicants submit that a recognizer that determines what words were spoken based on language models is quite different from a recognizer that spots at least one of a plurality of meaningful phrases in an input communication of a user including verbal input and non-verbal input, wherein each of the plurality of meaningful phrases has an association with at least one of a predetermined set of task objectives, as required by claim 1. The recognizer of <u>Strong</u> uses the language model to recognize what words were spoken by the user and is not used to spot any meaningful phrases in an input communication of the user.

<u>Gorin paper</u> does not satisfy the deficiencies of <u>Strong</u>. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over <u>Strong</u> in view of <u>Gorin paper</u> and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9-13 and 15-27 depend from claim 1, either directly or as a base claim, and are patentable over <u>Strong</u> in view of <u>Gorin paper</u> for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 7, 9-13 and 15-27 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 28 is similar to claim 1 and is patentable over <u>Strong</u> in view of <u>Gorin paper</u> for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 28 and claims 29, 20, 34, 26-40 and 42-54, which depend either directly or as a base claim for claim 28, be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 55

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as allegedly being anticipated by <u>Strong</u>. Applicants submit that the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 55 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 55 be withdrawn.

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

Having addressed all rejections and objections, , Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 10, 2006   by: /Richard C. Irving/

Correspondence Address: Richard C. Irving
AT&T Corp.   Attorney for Applicants
Room 2A-207   Reg. No. 38,499
One AT&T Way   Phone: 410-286-9405
Bedminster, NJ 07921   Fax No.: 410-510-1433